



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/965,151	09/27/2001	Dwip N. Banerjee	AUS920010573US1	6245
35525	7590	08/24/2005	EXAMINER	
IBM CORP (YA) C/O YEE & ASSOCIATES PC P.O. BOX 802333 DALLAS, TX 75380			NGUYEN, DUSTIN	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2154	

DATE MAILED: 08/24/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

47

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/965,151

Applicant(s)

BANERJEE ET AL.

Examiner

Dustin Nguyen

Art Unit

2154

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 June 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 21 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1 – 21 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ryu et al. [US Patent No. 5,295,836], in view of Boys [US Patent No 6,516,340].

4. As per claim 1, Ryu discloses the invention substantially as claimed including a method of making lecture notes available prior to a lecture, the method comprising the computer-implemented steps of:

receiving a set of lecture notes from a first client [i.e. lecturer and center station transmit lecture contents to terminal station] [Figure 1; and col 4, lines 38-48];

displaying the set of lecture notes to a second client [i.e. start the desired lecture at the terminal station] [3023, Figure 7; and col 8, lines 10-20];

Art Unit: 2154

providing the first client with a copy of the lecture notes having the question shown in association with the first section [i.e. interrupting the lecture and contact the lecturer to get the answer for the new question] [col 5, lines 15-40];

receiving modifications from the first client [i.e. lecturer provides answer to the new question] [A6', Figure 2; and col 7, lines 1-5]; and

applying the modifications to the set of lecture notes [i.e. register the new question and the corresponding answer and transmit answer to terminal station] [col 5, lines 41-50].

Ryu does not specifically disclose

wherein the lecture notes include a plurality of sections;

wherein a display of a section of the lecture notes contains a respective link for receiving questions regarding the content of the section;

receiving, from the second client, a question relating to a first section from the plurality of sections, said question being submitted using a respective first link.

Boys discloses

wherein the lecture notes include a plurality of sections [i.e. lectures A-N] [Figure 4; and col 12, lines 9-15];

wherein a display of a section of the lecture notes contains a respective link for receiving questions regarding the content of the section [i.e. Question button] [Figure 3; and col 10, lines 66-col 11, lines 7];

receiving, from the second client, a question relating to a first section from the plurality of sections [col 1, lines 45-50], said question being submitted using a respective first link [col 10, lines 66-col 11, lines 7].

It would have been obvious to a person skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Ryu and Boys because Boys' teaching of respective link for questions would allow to provide individual answer for each section of the lecture content so that it helps to keep track of the question and answer for easy understanding through the lecture.

5. As per claim 2, Ryu discloses in response to receiving the question, alerting the first client [i.e. contact] [306, Figure 3].

6. As per claim 3, Ryu does not specifically disclose the first client is alerted via electronic mail. Boys discloses the first client is alerted via electronic mail [col 11, lines 1-7]. It would have been obvious to a person skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Ryu and Boys because Boys' teaching would provide a quick and convenience interface for users to communicate with each other.

7. As per claim 4, Boys discloses the first client is alerted via instant message [i.e. chat] [col 5, lines 47-50].

8. As per claim 5, Boys discloses the lecture notes are displayed in a web browser [Figure 3; and col 9, lines 60-col10, lines 4].

9. As per claim 6, Boys discloses the documents are displayed on a mobile computing device [i.e. wireless laptop] [col 13, lines 1-6].

10. As per claims 7-12, they are program product claimed of claims 1-6, they are rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claims 1-6.

11. As per claim 13, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claim 1. Furthermore, Ryu discloses a bus system, a processing unit, including at least one processor and connected to the bus system; memory connected to the bus system; and a set of instructions [Figures 1 and 2].

12. As per claims 14-18, they are apparatus claimed of claims 2-6, they are rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claims 2-6.

13. As per claim 19, Ryu discloses the data processing system is connected to a network [30, Figure 2].

14. As per claim 20, Boys discloses the network is a wireless network [col 4, lines 33-37].

Reasons for Allowance

15. As per claim 21, the following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance:

I. Both Ryu and Boys do not teach or suggest receiving modifications to the copy of the original set of lecture notes to form a modified set of lecture notes; and saving the modified

set of lecture notes to the database such that the modified set of lecture notes replaces the original set of lecture notes.

Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

16. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-20 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

17. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2154

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dustin Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-3971. The examiner can normally be reached on flex.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached at (571) 272-3964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Dustin Nguyen

Examiner

Art Unit 2154


JOHN FOLLANSBEE
SUPERVISORY EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100